DISCLAIMER: In accordance with the *Community Safety and Policing Act* and the *Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act*, the summary below has been de-identified to remove the personal information of individuals, including public complainants and persons who were the subject of the investigation.

DE-IDENTIFIED SUMMARY UNDER SECTION 167(2) OF THE CSPA

Original Police Service:

Date of Complaint: 02/05/2025

Type of Investigation:

Referred to Same Service: ◉ Referred to Other Service: ○ Retained by LECA: ○

Service Investigations Referred to:

De-identified Summary of Complaint

[Complaint #1]

The complainant stated on September 7, 2024, they contacted the police regarding a surveillance camera being pointed in their backyard from their neighbours and was told to contact By-law. By-law advised it was a policing issue, so they contacted the police again on September 9, 2024, to put in the call for service. The complainant advised they received a call from the RO who left a message and stated he would not send someone to their home. The complainant states on October 2, 2024, they called police again and obtained the RO ' s email and asked why he was refusing to look into their complaint and he refused to provide his badge number. The complainant stated they told the officer they would not speak to the neighbours as their son uttered a death threat towards themself and their spouse. The complainant stated after emailing the Chief, the RO provided them with a reference number but did nothing about the cameras pointed into their backyard.

[Complaint #2]

The complainant outlined October 12, 2024, police attended their residence regarding a neighbour dispute. The complainant stated they (them-self and their spouse) were outside doing yard work when the officers arrived advising that their neighbour complained about them watering their trees. The complainant goes on to detail the issues and lies with the police report including the throwing of screws.

Unsubstantiated Code of Conduct Allegations

Allegation 1 - Conduct Undermines Public Trust CSPA 10(1) (E-202411211005277407)

Allegation 2 - Neglects to do duty CSPA 19 (E-202411211005277407)

Allegation 1 - Conduct Undermines Public Trust CSPA 10(1) (E-202411211019107008)

Allegation 2 - Neglects to do duty CSPA 10 (E-202411211019107008)

Decision and Reasons

[Complaint #1]

Allegation 1 - unsubstantiated - After reviewing all of the information which included the complainant's statement, the officers memorandum and the call details listed in the call history, the PSB investigator had insufficient evidence to substantiate the misconduct.

Allegation 2 - unsubstantiated - For the PSB investigator to meet the threshold of misconduct , the actions or inactions of the officer must "cross the line from mere performance considerations to matter of misconduct". The PSB investigator reviewed the complainant's statement to LECA, the officer memorandum, and the call details from the incident. Based on all of the information collected and to meet the threshold of misconduct, the PSB investigator had insufficient evidence to substantiate the misconduct.

[Complaint #2]

Allegation 1 - unsubstantiated - After reviewing all of the information which included the complainant's statement, the two (2) officers memorandums and duty book notes, the general occurrence report and the call details, the PSB investigator had insufficient evidence to substantiate the misconduct.

Allegation 2 - unsubstantiated - For the PSB investigator to meet the threshold of misconduct , the actions or inactions of the officer must "cross the line from mere performance considerations to matter of misconduct". The PSB investigator reviewed the complainant's statement, both of the officers notes and memorandums, the general occurrence report and the call details, the PSB investigator had insufficient evidence to substantiate the misconduct.